RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER AUG 0 6 2007

Appl. No. 10/803,330 Reply Filed: August 6, 2007 Reply to Final Office Action of: February 5, 2007

## REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed February 5, 2007, the Applicant submits this Reply. Applicant also submits a Notice of Appeal to accompany this Reply. In view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, reconsideration is requested.

Claims 13-18 remain in this application, of which claims 13 and 17 are independent. No fee is due for claim amendments.

In the Final Office Action, claims 13-18 were rejected.

## Objections to the Specification

The title has been amended, as was requested by the Office Action.

The Office Action states that the response to this case references an incorrect application number. It is unclear what the Office Action is referring to. The serial number on the prior response was correct. The applicant requested that the USPTO change its records regarding the attorney docket number. No amendment is made in response to this objection because it is unclear what the basis for the objection is.

## Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103 of Claims 13-18

Claims 13-18 remain in this application, of which claims 13 and 17 are independent, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of Japanese patent publication 2004-15181 ("Fujimori") in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0047475 to Tersaki and allegedly applicant admitted prior art ("AAPA"), namely paragraphs [0028], [0050], [0051] and [0052] of the present application. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to Fujimori, a module converts between a USB 2.0 bus and an IEEE-1394 bus (see abstract).

The Office Action relies on Terasaki for teaching "converting in the computer system the IEEE-1394 command to a USB command...", and refers to Figs. 1 and 2, elements 1-4 and paragraphs 117, 118 and 126 of Terasaki. Figs. 1 and 2 of Terasaki clearly show a personal computer (PC) that has both a IEEE-1394 bus and a USB bus. (see Fig. below). Terasaki is intended to prevent unauthorized copying of data from a device on one of these buses to a device

Appl. No. 10/803,330
Reply Filed: August 6, 2007
Reply to Final Office Action of: February 5, 2007

on the other of these buses. Terasaki fetches copyright data from the IEEE-1394 format packet and inserts it into appropriate locations in USB format packets. See, Terasaki, paragraph [0126].

Regarding the allegations of admitted prior art, the Office Action states, "the requirements of any transmission that converts between IEEE-1394 to USB in a way that complies with both notoriously well-known specifications requires that such drivers are present." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the position taken in the Office Action. The statement in the Office Action is an assertion by the Examiner, not an admission by the Applicant. The only prior art admitted by the applicant in the application is that it is known how to make a Windows driver that complies with the IEEE-1394 specification and it is known how to make a Windows driver that complies with the USB specification.

The invention as claimed in independent claims 13 and 17 involves sending IEEE-1394 commands through a USB port, but back to an IEEE-1394 device. The prior art fails to teach the kind of transmission as claimed.

In particular, regarding claim 13, as amended, neither Fujimori, nor Terasaki, nor the admitted prior art teaches or suggests that the video application on a computer generates IEEE-1394 commands, which are then converted in the computer to USB commands, which are then transmitted over a USB connection in the computer to a converter device, which in turn converts the USB command back into a IEEE-1394 command, which in turn is transmitted to the digital video device. Fujimori merely provides a USB-IEEE-1394 converter device and is silent about additional IEEE-1394-to-USB conversion being performed in the computer. Terasaki merely takes packets receive from a IEEE-1394 device and provides data in those packets to USB device. The prior art therefore fails to teach sending IEEE-1394 commands from a video application to a video device by sending such commands through a USB bus.

Similarly regarding claim 17, as amended, neither Fujimori, nor Terasaki nor the admitted prior art teaches or suggests that the digital video device generates IEEE-1394 commands, which are then converted in a converter device to USB commands, which are then transmitted over a USB connection to the computer, which in turn converts the USB command back into a IEEE-1394 command, which in turn is provided to the video application on the computer. Fujimori merely provides a USB-IEEE-1394 converter device and is silent about additional IEEE-1394-to-USB conversion being performed in the computer. Terasaki merely

Appl. No. 10/803,330 Reply Filed: August 6, 2007 Reply to Final Office Action of: February 5, 2007

takes packets receive from a IEEE-1394 device and provides data in those packets to USB device.

Accordingly, independent claims 13 and 17 are allowable over Fujimori, Terasaki and the alleged admitted prior art. The remaining claims are dependent claims that are allowable for at least the same reasons.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this reply, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, please charge any fee to **Deposit** Account No. 50-0876.

Respectfully submitted,

Avid Technology, Inc.

Peter J. Gordon

Registration No. 35,164 Avid Technology, Inc.

One Park West

Tewksbury, MA 01876

Tel.: (978) 640-6789

August 6, 2007